

5.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING

This section of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) examines the potential for socioeconomic impacts of the proposed The Ontario Plan on the City of Ontario, including changes in population, employment, and demand for housing, particularly housing cost/rent ranges defined as “affordable.”

Current website information and pertinent documents from the City of Ontario and other appropriate agencies were used in preparation of this section. The analysis in this section is based, in part, upon information from:

- Southern California Association of Governments
- United States Census Bureau
- California Department of Finance

5.13.1 Environmental Setting

State Regulations

California Housing Element Law

California planning and zoning law requires each city and county to adopt a general plan for future growth (California Government Code Section 65300). This plan must include a housing element that identifies housing needs for all economic segments and provides opportunities for housing development to meet that need. At the state level, the Housing and Community Development Department estimates the relative share of California’s projected population growth that would occur in each county in the state based on California Department of Finance (DOF) population projections and historical growth trends. Where there is a regional council of governments, the Housing and Community Development Department provides the regional housing need to the council. The council then assigns a share of the regional housing need to each of its cities and counties. The process of assigning shares provides cities and counties the opportunity to comment on the proposed allocations. The Housing and Community Development Department oversees the process to ensure that the council of governments distributes its share of the state’s projected housing need.



The California Housing Element Section 65580 to 65589 of the Government Code requires that each City and County identify and analyze existing and projected housing needs within its jurisdiction and prepare goals, policies, and programs to further the development, improvement, and preservation of housing for all economic segments of the community commensurate with local housing needs. State law recognizes the vital role local governments play in the supply and affordability of housing.

To that end, the Government Code requires that the housing element achieve legislative goals to identify adequate sites to facilitate and encourage the development, maintenance, and improvement of housing for households of all economic levels, including persons with disabilities; remove, as legally feasible and appropriate, governmental constraints to the production, maintenance, and improvement of housing for persons of all incomes including those with disabilities; assist in the development of adequate housing to meet the needs of low and moderate income households; conserve and improve the condition of housing and neighborhoods, including existing affordable housing; promote housing opportunities for all persons regardless of race, religion, sex, marital status, ancestry, national origin, color, familial status, or disability; and preserve for lower income households the publicly assisted multifamily housing developments in each community.

5. Environmental Analysis

POPULATION AND HOUSING

Regional

Southern California Association of Governments

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) represents Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura Counties. It is a regional planning agency and serves as a forum for addressing regional issues concerning transportation, the economy, community development, and the environment.

SCAG adopted a package of advisory growth policies in its 2008 Regional Comprehensive Plan. The policies coordinate infrastructure development with projected population, housing, and employment growth. In its efforts to develop a regional transportation network that maximizes access and mobility, minimizes congestion, and protects the quality of life, SCAG focuses particular attention on the relationship between jobs and housing. Policies encourage local jurisdictions to balance job and housing opportunities. SCAG policies also encourage job growth near transit services and transit nodes and near existing freeways and toll roads to reduce vehicle miles traveled and congestion, and the air pollution that accompany them.

Compass Blueprint

SCAG adopted the Compass Blueprint in 2004 as a framework to help local jurisdictions address growth management issues through coordination of regional land use and transportation planning. The Compass Blueprint aims to improve the quality of life in the region through its Growth Vision Principals of mobility, livability, prosperity, and sustainability. Compass Blueprint, through extensive public participation, land use, and transportation modeling and analysis, has resulted in a plan that identifies strategic growth opportunity areas (2% Strategy Opportunity Areas) where the Compass Blueprint will help cities and counties reap the maximum benefits from regional planning implemented in cooperation and partnership with the local community. The Compass Blueprint 2% Strategy is a guideline for how and where local jurisdictions can implement the Compass Blueprint's Growth Vision. The Growth Vision encourages growth in existing and emerging centers and along major transportation corridors, creating mixed-use, development and walkable communities, targeting growth around existing and planned transit stations, and preserving existing open space and stable residential areas. The City of Ontario is in a Compass Blueprint 2% Strategy Opportunity Area (SCAG 2007).

Methodology

The project area's demographics are examined in the context of existing and projected population for the San Bernardino County region and the City of Ontario. Information on population, housing, and employment for the project area is available from several sources.

US Census – The official United States Census is described in Article I, Section 2 of the Constitution of the United States. It calls for an actual enumeration of the people every 10 years, to be used for apportionment among the states of seats in the House of Representatives. The United States Census Bureau publishes population and household data gathered in the decennial census. This information provides a record of historical growth rates in Riverside County and the City of Ontario.

California Department of Finance – The DOF prepares and administers California's Annual Budget. Other duties include estimating population demographics and enrollment projections. The E-5 City/County Population and Housing Estimates reports on population and housing estimates from January 1, 2001 through January 1, 2007, and provisional population and housing estimates for January 1, 2008, for the state, counties, and cities, benchmarked to base year 2000.

5. Environmental Analysis

POPULATION AND HOUSING

Southern California Association of Governments – Policies and programs adopted by SCAG to achieve regional objectives are expressed in its Regional Comprehensive Plan.

Planning Projections

Population Trends

As housing has become more expensive and buildable land scarce in the Los Angeles metropolitan region, San Bernardino County has experienced significant growth in population. The county saw its first appreciable growth spurt between 1980 and 1990, when the county population passed the one million mark. According to DOF, between 1990 and 2000 San Bernardino County witnessed a 20 percent increase in population, an annual average of 29,105. Between 2000 to and 2008, the DOF estimates the population in San Bernardino County rose approximately 345,627 to 2,055,766 in 2008, or 20 percent.

The City of Ontario has experienced steady population growth of an average of 1.5 percent, less than the county average of 2.1 percent. According to the DOF, which uses estimates based on the most recent decennial US Census and modified using building permit information provided by the county, the City has an estimated population of 173,690, approximately 8.4 percent of the county's population in 2008. The 2008 estimate is a 23 percent increase from the City's population in 1990. During the same period, San Bernardino County experienced a 45 percent increase. The county's population and annual population change percentages relative to the county are shown in Table 5.13-1.

Table 5.13-1
Historic Population Growth Trends in City of Ontario and County of San Bernardino

Year	City Population	Percent Change from Previous Year	County Population	Percent Change from Previous Year
1990	133,179		1,418,380	
1991	136,383	2.4%	1,464,203	3.2%
1992	139,516	2.3%	1,516,475	3.6%
1993	141,264	1.3%	1,546,550	2.0%
1994	143,097	1.3%	1,562,188	1.0%
1995	144,087	0.7%	1,574,240	0.8%
1996	145,459	1.0%	1,591,186	1.1%
1997	147,322	1.3%	1,613,959	1.4%
1998	150,021	1.8%	1,638,423	1.5%
1999	152,413	1.6%	1,667,189	1.8%
2000	157,442	3.3%	1,710,139	2.6%
2001	159,628	1.4%	1,746,732	2.1%
2002	163,345	2.3%	1,792,367	2.6%
2003	166,239	1.8%	1,839,885	2.7%
2004	168,365	1.3%	1,893,154	2.9%
2005	170,129	1.0%	1,945,242	2.8%
2006	170,743	0.4%	1,990,967	2.4%
2007	172,363	0.9%	2,026,325	1.8%
2008	173,690	0.8%	2,055,766	1.5%

Source: DOF 2008



5. Environmental Analysis

POPULATION AND HOUSING

Existing Population

According to the DOF, the City of Ontario had a population of 173,690 in 2008, less than 1 percent more than 2007. Ethnically, the City of Ontario has experienced a shift of from a white majority to a nonwhite Hispanic majority, as shown in Table 5.13-2. During that period there has been a net loss of 20,571 people, or 33 percent, among the white population. In comparison, the nonwhite Hispanic population has experienced a net gain of 39,068, or 70 percent, in the same period.

Table 5.13-2
Race and Ethnicity in Ontario

Race and Ethnicity	Population		Percent of Population	
	1990	2000	1990	2000
Nonwhite Hispanic	55,542	94,610	42%	60%
Asian ¹	4,831	6,433	4%	4%
White	62,619	42,048	47%	27%
African American	9,235	11,317	7%	7%
American Indian ²	559	475	<1%	<1%
All Others ³	393	3,124	<1%	2%
Total	133,179	158,007	100%	100%

Source: 1990 US Census, 2000 US Census.

¹ Asian category includes Asian, Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander

² American Indian category includes American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut

³ "All others" includes multiracial categories; the 1990 and 2000 categories are not comparable.

Housing

Housing Trends

Housing growth in the City of Ontario and the County of San Bernardino has been consistent, but population has outpaced housing in both jurisdictions (see Tables 5.13-1 and 5.13-3). In 2008, the City of Ontario had an estimated 47,276 housing units, an 11 percent increase from 1990s. During the same time period, San Bernardino County experienced a 26 percent increase in total housing units. The City of Ontario has a total of 7 percent of the housing stock in the county. Total housing units and annual housing change percentages are shown in Table 5.13-3.

5. Environmental Analysis

POPULATION AND HOUSING

Table 5.13-3
Historical Housing Growth Trends in County of San Bernardino and City of Ontario

Year	City Population	Percent Change	County Population	Percent Change
1990	42,536		542,332	
1991	42,853	0.7%	554,300	2.2%
1992	43,155	0.7%	561,931	1.4%
1993	43,347	0.4%	568,976	1.3%
1994	43,718	0.9%	575,036	1.1%
1995	43,852	0.3%	579,433	0.8%
1996	43,904	0.1%	582,446	0.5%
1997	43,841	-0.1%	585,441	0.5%
1998	43,986	0.3%	589,979	0.8%
1999	44,182	0.4%	594,740	0.8%
2000	45,182	2.3%	601,369	1.1%
2001	45,237	0.1%	605,809	0.7%
2002	45,519	0.6%	613,139	1.2%
2003	45,756	0.5%	621,964	1.4%
2004	45,850	0.2%	632,267	1.7%
2005	46,070	0.5%	645,627	2.1%
2006	46,351	0.6%	661,668	2.5%
2007	46,959	1.3%	676,909	2.3%
2008	47,276	0.7%	685,642	1.3%

Source: DOF 2008

Existing Housing Units

As shown in Table 5.13-4, the City of Ontario's housing stock consisted of 47,276 dwelling units in 2008, an increase of 2,094 units since the 2000 Census. Of the total units in the City, approximately 66 percent are single-family attached and detached units, 30 percent are multifamily units, and 5 percent are mobile homes. The county's housing mix shows similar distribution by housing types. The single-family units make up the majority of the housing approximately 75 percent, followed by 19 percent multifamily units and 7 percent mobile home units.

Table 5.13-4
Housing Units By Type (2008) - City of Ontario

Type	Ontario		San Bernardino County	
	Number of Units	Percent	Number of Units	Percent
Single-Family Detached	27,569	58%	483,447	71%
Single-Family Attached	3,649	8%	28,459	4%
Multifamily (2-4 Units)	4,075	9%	40,321	6%
Multifamily (5 or More Units)	9,820	21%	88,714	13%
Mobile Homes	2,163	5%	44,701	7%
Totals	47,276	100%	685,642	100%
	Percent Vacant = 3.67%		Percent Vacant = 11.61%	
	Household Size = 3.79		Household Size = 3.31	

Source: DOF 2008.



5. Environmental Analysis

POPULATION AND HOUSING

The vacancy rate for the City of Ontario was 3.7 percent, well below the San Bernardino County vacancy rate of 11.6 percent. Traditionally, a high vacancy rate indicates either the existence of a high number of undesired units or an oversupply of units. The high rate in the county can be related to the current housing readjustment.

Housing Costs

As in the majority of southern California communities, housing costs in Ontario and the county escalated steeply during the early 2000s, but have recently decreased due to the current market readjustment. In San Bernardino County, the median sales price for a housing unit was \$230,000 in 2008, a drop of 35 percent from \$355,000 the year before (Data Quick 2008). Similarly, in the City the median sales price for a housing unit was \$270,000 in 2008, a drop of 30.9 percent from \$390,500 the year before.

Employment

Employment Trends

According to the California Employment Development Department, the growth rate of employment in the City has slowed down in recent years. As of September 2008, the estimated employment in the City of Ontario is 79,201. Employment in the County of San Bernardino has mirrored the City of Ontario, as employment has slowed down since 2004. San Bernardino County has experienced a net loss of 13,000 jobs from 2007 to September 2008, a decline of 1.6 percent; the City of Ontario experienced a net loss of 301, a decline of .38 percent. The City's employment and annual employment change percentages relative to the county are shown in Table 5.13-5.

Table 5.13-5
Historical Employment Growth Trends in County of San Bernardino and Ontario

Year	City Employment	Percent Change	County Employment	Percent Change
2000	66,500		703,600	
2001	68,500	3.0%	724,500	3.0%
2002	70,200	2.5%	743,200	2.6%
2003	71,600	2.0%	757,500	1.9%
2004	74,400	3.9%	787,800	4.0%
2005	77,100	3.6%	815,600	3.5%
2006	78,600	1.9%	831,800	2.0%
2007	78,900	0.4%	835,100	0.4%
2008 ¹	79,201	0.4%	822,100	-1.6%

Source: California Employment Development Department.

Note: Employment is defined as the number of individuals, aged 16 years or older, who are working.

¹ September 2008

Existing Employment

Table 5.13-6 shows the City's workforce by occupation and industry. According to the 2000 Census, the City of Ontario had an employed civilian labor force (16 years and older) of 68,521 persons. The largest occupational categories are sales and office occupations and production, transportation, and material moving occupations, which account for 50 percent of the jobs available in the City. In 2000, the City of Ontario's workforce comprised 9.3 percent of San Bernardino County's workforce.

Table 5.13-6
Employment by Sector

<i>Occupation/Industry</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Occupation		
Management, professional, and related occupations	12,927	20.7%
Service occupations	9,456	15.1%
Sales and office occupations	16,874	27.0%
Farming, fishing, and forestry occupations	943	15.0%
Construction, extraction, and maintenance operations	7,218	11.6%
Production, transportation, and material moving occupations	14,999	24.0%
Industry		
Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining	1,295	2.1%
Construction	4,552	7.3%
Manufacturing	12,345	19.8%
Wholesale trade	3,274	5.2%
Retail trade	7,660	12.3%
Transportation, warehousing, and utilities	4,171	6.7%
Information	1,496	2.4%
Finance, insurance, real estate, and rental and leasing	3,097	5.0%
Professional, scientific, management, administrative, and waste management services	4,833	7.7%
Educational, health, and social services	9,120	14.6%
Other services (except public administration)	4,752	7.6%
Arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation and food services	3,398	5.4%
Public administration	2,424	3.9%
Source: 2000 U.S. Census.		



Jobs/Housing Ratio

The jobs/housing ratio is a general measure of the total number of jobs and number of housing units in a defined geographic area, without regard to economic constraints or individual preferences. The balance of jobs and housing in an area, in terms of the total number of jobs and housing units as well as the type of jobs versus the price of housing, has implications for mobility, air quality, and the distribution of tax revenues. The jobs/housing ratio is one indicator of a project's effect on growth and quality of life in the project area. SCAG applies the jobs/housing ratio at the regional and subregional levels to analyze the fit between jobs, housing, and infrastructure. A major focus of SCAG's regional planning efforts has been to improve this balance. SCAG defines the jobs/housing balance as follows:

Jobs and housing are in balance when an area has enough employment opportunities for most of the people who live there and enough housing opportunities for most of the people who work there. The region as a whole is, by definition, balanced.... Job-rich subregions have ratios greater than the regional average; housing-rich subregions have ratios lower than the regional average.

Ideally, job/housing balance would... assure not only a numerical match of jobs and housing but also an economic match in type of jobs and housing. (SCAG 1989, 1997)

Jobs/housing goals and ratios are advisory only. No ideal jobs/housing ratio is adopted in state, regional, or city policies. However, SCAG considers an area balanced when the jobs/housing ratio is 1.36; communities with more than 1.36 jobs per dwelling unit are considered jobs-rich and those with fewer than 1.36 are

5. Environmental Analysis

POPULATION AND HOUSING

housing-rich (SCAG 2004). Additionally, the DOF estimates that a healthy jobs/housing balance is one new home built for every 1.5 jobs created (Job-Center Housing Coalition, The California Alliance for Jobs). A job/housing imbalance is an indication of potential air quality and traffic problems associated with commuting.

The City of Ontario's population and housing growth has not matched employment growth. The City's population, housing, and employment have been growing at a constant pace, but employment opportunities outnumber housing more than two to one. According to SCAG, from 2003 to 2008 employment in Ontario increased by 20 percent; in comparison, housing increased by 11 percent. As shown in Table 5.13-7, in 2003 the City had a jobs/housing ratio of 2.20, with a disproportionate number of employment opportunities to housing; in 2008 the jobs/housing ratio had increased to 2.50. The high number suggests that a large number of Ontario workers are commuters to the City. The jobs/housing ratio for the entire San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) subregion was 1.16 in 2003 and 1.25 in 2008. SCAG projects employment will grow disproportionately to housing through 2035. According to SCAG projections, the City is expected to remain jobs-rich, and the jobs/housing ratio is expected to decrease from 2.50 in 2008 to 2.04 in 2035.

**Table 5.13-7
Jobs/Housing Ratio**

	2003		2008		Projected 2035	
	SANBAG	Ontario	SANBAG	Ontario	SANBAG	Ontario
Employment	638,944 ¹	97,172 ¹	767,835 ^{1,2}	117,078 ^{1,2}	1,254,749 ¹	187,671 ¹
Households	552,201 ¹	44,122 ¹	612,861 ^{1,3}	46,902 ^{1,3}	972,561 ¹	91,936 ¹
Jobs/Housing	1.16	2.20	1.25	2.50	1.29	2.04

¹ SCAG 2008 RTP Growth Forecast 2035.

² 2008 employment projections extrapolated from 2005–2010 SCAG 2008 RTP Growth Forecast.

³ 2008 household projections extrapolated from 2005–2010 SCAG 2008 RTP Growth Forecast.

The Los Angeles Ontario International Airport (LAONT) impacts the availability of land for housing and jobs in the City of Ontario. The LAONT is in the center of the City, encompassing approximately 1,700 acres, and is currently a medium-hub, full-service airport with passenger and cargo jet service. LAONT precludes the development of certain land uses due to noise and safety hazards and other land use incompatibilities. The noise and safety zones surrounding LAONT limit the density and intensity of allowable uses within its influence area, limiting uses such as housing, while encouraging such uses as retail, office, industrial, warehousing, and airport service-related uses. The LAONT is a physical barrier for the development of housing and has influenced the jobs/housing ratio, as the surrounding appropriate land uses are airport-related services.

Regional Jobs/Housing Ratio

According to SCAG, a community with a jobs/housing ratio less than 1.36 is considered housing-rich. As of 2008, the SANBAG Subregion had a housing-rich jobs/housing ratio of 1.25 (see Table 5.13-7). A strategy of Compass Blueprint is to focus growth in existing and emerging centers along major transportation corridors. SCAG is currently working with the City of Ontario on its Compass Blueprint 2% Strategy, and has identified the City as a Compass Strategic Opportunity Area. SCAG's goals are to alleviate the housing-rich SANBAG subregion by focusing employment opportunities in the City. A key element of Compass Blueprint is to increase the region's mobility. By encouraging employment opportunities in the City of Ontario, SCAG hopes to balance regional land use and transportation growth within the Subregion.

Planning Projections

County of San Bernardino Population, Housing, and Employment Projections

SCAG undertakes comprehensive regional planning with an emphasis on transportation, producing a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The 2008 RTP provides projections of population, households, and total employment for San Bernardino County from 2003 through 2035. Based on San Bernardino County’s share of California’s and the region’s employment growth, migration and immigration trends, and birth rates, SCAG projects that population, housing, and employment will grow at an increasing rate. The County of San Bernardino is growing by an average of 40,131 persons per year and an average of 13,836 housing units per year, and employment is projected to increase an average of 17,062 jobs per year from 2005 to 2025. According to SCAG, Riverside and San Bernardino Counties will continue to see the greatest percentage in population growth in the entire SCAG region. By 2035, approximately 27 percent of SCAG residents are anticipated to live in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties. The total projected increases between 2005 and 2025 for population, housing, and employment are shown in Table 5.13-8.

Table 5.13-8
Projected Population, Housing, and Employment for County of San Bernardino

	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	Increase, 2005–2025	
						Total	Percent
Population	1,971,318	2,182,049	2,385,748	2,582,765	2,773,945	802,627	41%
Households	576,277	637,250	718,602	787,142	852,986	276,709	48%
Employment	704,239	810,233	897,489	965,778	1,045,480	341,241	48%

Source: SCAG 2008 RTP Growth Forecast 2035



City of Ontario Population, Housing, and Employment Projections

The City of Ontario is expected to outpace San Bernardino County’s population growth. According to SCAG, from 2005 to 2025, the population of the City is expected to increase by 106,848 to 277,799, or 63 percent. The City of Ontario is projected to grow by an average of 5,342 persons per year, and 1,531 housing units per year, and employment is projected to increase an average of 2,643 jobs per year from 2005 to 2025. The total projected increases between 2005 and 2025 for population, housing, employment are shown in Table 5.13-9.

Table 5.13-9
Projected Population, Housing, and Employment for City of Ontario

	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	Increase, 2005–2025	
						Total	Percent
Population	170,951	187,060	213,839	246,304	277,799	106,848	63%
Households	44,518	48,491	56,242	65,872	75,132	30,614	69%
Employment	107,790	123,270	136,302	147,518	160,654	52,864	49%

Source: SCAG 2008 RTP Growth Forecast 2035

5. Environmental Analysis

POPULATION AND HOUSING

Plans and Policies Pertaining to Population and Housing

Regional Transportation Plan

As the Metropolitan Planning Organization for Los Angeles County, SCAG prepares an RTP pursuant to federal and state requirements; the most recent RTP was approved in May 2008. The RTP includes goals, objectives, and policies that guide transportation planning in the County. Those relevant to the proposed project are:

- Maximize mobility and accessibility for all people and goods in the region
- Ensure travel safety and reliability for all people and goods in the region
- Preserve and ensure a sustainable regional transportation system
- Maximize the productivity of our transportation system
- Protect the environment, improve air quality, and promote energy efficiency
- Encourage land use and growth patterns that complement our transportation investments
- Maximize the security of the regional transportation system through improved system
- Monitoring, rapid recovery planning, and coordination with other security agencies

Regional Housing Needs Assessment

The Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) is mandated by state housing law as part of the periodic process of updating housing elements of local general plans. State law requires that housing elements identify RHNA targets set by California's Department of Housing and Community Development to encourage each jurisdiction in the state to provide its fair share of very low, low, moderate, and upper income housing. The RHNA does not encourage or promote growth, but provides a long-term outline for housing within the context of local and regional trends and housing production goals. The City of Ontario Housing Element provides a thorough discussion, as well as goals and policies, addressing issues of housing affordability. Goals and policies identified in The Ontario Plan are consistent with the goals and policies identified in the previously approved Housing Element.

Government Code Section 65863 restricts cities' ability to reduce the maximum allowable density in area already designated or zoned for residential uses to a level below the density used by the Housing and Community Development Department when determining whether a city's housing element complies with state law. It is immaterial under the statute whether the reduction is initiated by a city or by a member of the public. A city may not require nor permit the reduction of density of any residentially designated parcel unless the city finds the proposed reduction in density is consistent with its general plan, and that the remaining sites identified in the housing element are adequate to accommodate the city's share of regional housing needs.

If a city cannot make the second finding, it may still make the reduction in density if it determines there are sufficient "additional, adequate, and available" sites with equal or greater residential capacity in the jurisdiction so that there is no net loss of residential unit capacity. In some instances, it may be necessary for the city to "up-zone" some other area of the city in order to legally accomplish a down zoning (Government Code Section 65863).

5. Environmental Analysis

POPULATION AND HOUSING

The City of Ontario filed an appeal to a portion of their regional housing needs construction goal for the 2006–2014 RHNA planning period. The City cited land constrained by active Williamson Act contracts, land constrained by southern California agricultural preserve limitations created by the Chino Airport flight path, and lack of infrastructure. SCAG reduced the City's RHNA from 14,096 housing units to 7,661. Table 5.13-10 presents the RHNA targets for each income level, with an overall housing production target of 7,661 new units.

Table 5.13-10
City of Ontario RHNA Targets, January 1, 2006–June 30, 2014

Household Income Category	Percentage	Target Number (Units)
Very Low Income	23.9%	1,828
Low Income	16.2%	1,243
Moderate Income	18.6%	1,425
Upper Income	41.3%	3,165
Totals	100%	7,661

Source: SCAG Final RHNAP

Ontario prepares two plans, the Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice and the Consolidated Plan, as a condition of receiving federal funds for housing and community development activities. The Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice is designed to ensure that City policies and programs affirmatively further fair housing. The Consolidated Plan identifies housing and community development needs and programs for lower and moderate income households and households with special needs.



In conjunction with these programs, and other affordable housing programs provided by the county, the City has completed other affordable housing projects. In 2007, the City provided more than 2,800 affordable housing units to low to moderate incomes: 12 deed-restricted multiple-family housing projects that provided more than 800 units, 1,760 mobile homes, and 3 projects in the Ontario Town Center planned to provide 300+ affordable housing units. Table 5.13-11 provides an inventory of all publicly subsidized affordable housing projects in Ontario.

5. Environmental Analysis

POPULATION AND HOUSING

Table 5.13-11
Inventory of Affordable Housing Projects in Ontario

Project /Address	Unit Type	Total & Assisted Units
Casitas Apartments – 1900 S. Campus	Family	253 units/48 units
Cambridge Square – 1037 N. Archibald Avenue	Family	125 units/50 units
Cinnamon Ridge Apartments – 1051 E. 4th Street	Senior	101 units/101 units
Estancia/Vineyard Apts. – 1720 E. “D” Street	Family	152 units/85 units
Cedar Villas – 301 East Cedar Street	Senior	136 units/123 units
LandMark at Ontario – 950 N. Duesenberg Drive	Family	469 units/71 units
Mission Oaks – 1427 W. Mission	Family	80 units/80 units
Mtn View Senior Phase 1 – 511 N. Palmetto	Senior	86 units/86 units
Grove Apartments – 227 W. “H” Street	Senior	101 units/100 units
Ontario Sr. Housing Ph 1 – 1433 E. “D” Street	Senior	91 units/90 units
Ontario Townhomes – 1230 E. “D” Street	Family	86 units/86 units
Parc Vista – 1206 W. 4th Street	Family	78 units/78 units
Park Centre – 850 N. Center Street	Family	404 units/101 units
Terrace View – 1130 W. 4th Street	Family	75 units/75 units
Seasons at Gateway – 955 N. Palmetto	Senior	80 units/80 units
Vintage Apartments – 955 N. Duesenberg Drive	Family	300 units/45 units
Waterford Court – 1739 “G” Street	Family	165 Units/50 units
Waverly Place – 1739 G Street	Family	155 units/62 units
Woodside II – 302 W. “G” Street	Senior	60 units/60 units
Woodside III – 406-548 N. Imperial	Senior	84 units/84 units
Mercy House (Parkside) – 411 & 412 Parkside Avenue 517, 521, and 525 Virginia	Homeless	7 units/14 units

Source: City of Ontario 2007

5.13.2 Thresholds of Significance

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project would normally have a significant effect on the environment if the project would:

- P-1 Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).
- P-2 Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.
- P-3 Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

5.13.3 Environmental Impacts

It is important to note the differences between buildout and the SCAG projections. The Ontario Plan Proposed Land Use Plan for the ultimate development of the City is not linked to a timeline. In addition, The Ontario Plan provides policy level guidance and does not contain specific project proposals. On the other hand, the SCAG projections are based on annual increments. Since buildout of The Ontario Plan is not linked to a time frame, it is not appropriate to make a direct comparison with the population, housing, and

5. Environmental Analysis

POPULATION AND HOUSING

employment projections provided by SCAG. However, for purposes of this CEQA analysis, the 20-year SCAG projections are used for general comparison purposes.

It is also important to note that the buildout to the maximum levels permitted by The Ontario Plan is not anticipated to occur in the future. The City has historically experienced citywide buildout levels that do not achieve the maximum allowable density/intensity on every parcel and are, on average, lower than allowed in The Ontario Plan. The analysis of The Ontario Plan is based on the maximums allowed in The Ontario Plan to determine the significance of impacts and not historic levels of development intensity (see Appendix J, *Buildout Modeling Methodology*).

The following impact analysis addresses thresholds of significance for which the Initial Study disclosed potentially significant impacts. The applicable thresholds are identified in brackets after the impact statement.

IMPACT 5.13-1: THE PROPOSED PROJECT WOULD DIRECTLY RESULT IN POPULATION GROWTH IN THE PROJECT AREA. [THRESHOLD P-1]

Impact Analysis: One of the purposes of The Ontario Plan is to adequately plan and accommodate future growth. Implementation of The Ontario Plan accommodates population growth through land use designations, goals, and policies that provide a vision and guide growth in the City. The Proposed Land Use Plan land use designations include rural, low density, low-medium density, medium density, high density, and mixed use residential development uses; retail/service and employment land use designations such as Neighborhood General, General Commercial, Office/Commercial, Hospitality, Business Park, Industrial, and Overlay; and other land use designations such as Public Facility, Public School, and LAONT, development of which could lead to population growth by providing either housing or employment opportunities in the City.

Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Plan would result in a total buildout potential of 535 rural, 32,766 low density, 6,807 low-medium density, 39,179 medium density, and 8,334 high density residential units in the City, in addition to 17,023 mixed-use units, for a total of 104,644 residential units (see Table 3-4). Consequently, The Ontario Plan accommodates a total of 360,851 people. According to DOF, in 2008, the population of the City of Ontario was approximately 173,690. Buildout in accordance with The Ontario Plan would therefore result in a population increase of 187,161 people, an approximate increase of 108 percent, or a 4.9 percent annual population increase. As a result, the anticipated growth rate from The Ontario Plan buildout would be the highest historical rate of population increase for the City (see Table 5.13-1). The Proposed Land Use Plan also provides for a total of 1,568 acres of Retail/Service (Neighborhood General, General Commercial, Office/Commercial, Hospitality, and Administrative/Professional Commercial) and 7,948 acres of employment uses (Business Park and Industrial). The land use plan could generate approximately 325,794 employment opportunities in the City.

City of Ontario Jobs/Housing Ratio

Table 5.13-12 compares the City's buildout projections for population, households, and employment to SCAG projections. SCAG projects the City to be jobs-rich, with a jobs/housing ratio of approximately 2 to 1 in 2035. The 2035 SCAG projections forecast an increase of approximately 166,144 people or 97 percent over 30 years. This equates to an average increase in population of approximately 3.2 percent per year. In comparison, the Proposed Land Use Plan would result in a population increase of approximately 189,900, or 111 percent from 2005 to 2035. This equates to an average increase in population of 3.7 percent per year.



5. Environmental Analysis

POPULATION AND HOUSING

Table 5.13-12
Comparison of SCAG 2035 and The Ontario Plan Buildout Projections

	<i>SCAG Projections for City of Ontario</i>		<i>The Ontario Plan Buildout Projections</i>
	2005	2035	2035
Population	170,951	337,095	360,851
Employment	107,790	187,671	325,794
Households	44,518	91,936	104,644
Jobs/Housing Ratio	2.42	2.04	3.11

Source: SCAG 2008 RTP Growth Forecast 2035

The number of jobs projected at buildout of The Ontario Plan would also be higher than SCAG's projections for year 2035. The Proposed Land Use Plan would create 325,794 jobs as compared to SCAG's 174,924 jobs. As a result, the City's jobs/housing ratio with buildout of the Proposed Land Use Plan would be substantially higher at buildout (3.11) than projected by SCAG for the year 2035 (2.04). Therefore, buildout of The Ontario Plan would result both population and employment growth that has not been forecast by SCAG.

Regional Jobs/Housing Ratio

While the City of Ontario is projected to be jobs-rich, the SANBAG subregion as a whole is housing-rich. In general, the LAONT dictates land uses around the airport. The central location of the airport in the City makes it difficult to plan residential land uses immediately surrounding the airport because of the restrictions on sensitive uses as a result of airport safety and noise hazards. SCAG's 2008 RTP predicts that by 2030 passenger service will double and air cargo will triple in the region. Rather than expanding LAONT, the RTP suggests accommodating this growth at outlying airports. The RTP relies on LAONT to accommodate a larger share of the total passenger and air cargo demand in the future in order to serve this growing regional demand. In addition, LAONT brings issues of compatibility, noise, safety, pollution, and traffic. The size, location in the City, and noise and safety zones surrounding LAONT provide a physical barrier for the development of sensitive land uses such as housing, and therefore encourages placement of compatible land uses such as retail, office, industrial, warehousing, and airport service-related uses. Consequently, the City of Ontario is inherently jobs-rich. However, by increasing the number of employment opportunities in the City, The Ontario Plan helps to reduce the jobs/housing imbalance in the southwestern portion of the SANBAG subregion.

Table 5.13-13 compares population, household, and employment projections for the City of Ontario to SCAG's 2008 RTP projections for the City and the SANBAG subregion in 2035. Buildout under The Ontario Plan would increase SCAG projections for the City by 23,756 people, 138,123 employees, and 12,708 households. As Table 5.13-13 illustrates, when this difference is added to SCAG's 2035 projections for the SANBAG subregion, the jobs/housing ratio for the SANBAG subregion improves from a housing-rich 1.29 to an approximate jobs/housing balance of 1.41. The concentration of jobs in the City would help reach the jobs/housing ratio of 1.41 recommended by the 2004 SCAG Compass Growth Vision Report for the San Bernardino Basin. By providing more employment opportunities in the City, the Proposed Land Use Plan reduces vehicle miles traveled within the subregion because it reduces the number of SANBAG commuters that travel to Orange County and Los Angeles County for employment. Therefore, although the City is imbalanced the employment opportunities provided within the City help to balance the regional jobs/housing ratio in the SANBAG subregion. This would help SANBAG address the regional jobs deficiency and allow a greater number of residents in the region to live and work in the City and surrounding areas.

Table 5.13-13
Comparison of SCAG 2035 and The Ontario Plan Buildout Projections
for City of Ontario and SANBAG Subregion

	SCAG Projections for City of Ontario	The Ontario Plan Buildout Projections	Difference Between SCAG and Ontario Plan	SCAG Projections for SANBAG Subregion	SANBAG Plus Difference
Population	337,095	360,851	23,756	3,133,801	3,157,557
Employment	187,671	325,794	138,123	1,254,749	1,392,872
Households	91,936	104,644	12,708	972,561	985,269
Jobs/Housing Ratio	2.04	3.11	–	1.29	1.41

Source: SCAG 2008 RTP Growth Forecast 2035

Consistency with SCAG's Compass Blueprint

SCAG identified the northern half of the City of Ontario as a Compass 2% Strategy Opportunity Area. The purpose of the 2% Strategy is to balance employment, housing, and services on a regional level to reduce vehicle miles traveled, reduce air pollutant emissions, enhance livability, expand prosperity, and increase sustainability in the SCAG region. SCAG's 2% Strategy is an advisory or voluntary plan to accommodate population growth in the SCAG region by altering current growth trends in a small fraction of the region. The program promotes mixed-use development, better access to jobs, conservation of open space, public/private partnerships, improving the capacity and efficiency of movement of goods, reducing vehicle miles traveled, improving air quality, improving housing availability and affordability, and renovating urban cores (SCAG 2007). Policies LU1-1, LU1-2, LU1-5, LU5-1, LU5-2, LU5-3 of the Ontario Plan require that the City identify areas of strategic growth; coordinate land use, infrastructure, and transportation with regional, county, and other local agencies to further regional and subregional goals for jobs/housing balance; and work with agencies to mitigate the impacts and hazards related to airport operations.



The Ontario Plan is consistent with the Compass 2% Strategy Opportunity Area map, because it provides mixed-use opportunities around the Interstate 10 (I-10) corridor and in the New Model Colony (NMC) and employment opportunities around the LAONT to reduce vehicle miles traveled in the housing-rich SANBAG subregion. Consequently, The Ontario Plan would increase livability by allowing for land uses that are compatible in the LAONT and providing higher density housing opportunities along the I-10 corridor and in the NMC. In addition, SCAG identified Ontario's historic downtown as one of the areas in the region where intensification opportunities exist to address the challenges of that Southern California will face in the coming years (SCAG 2008). The Land Use Element of The Policy Plan designates Focus Areas that identify portions of Ontario's historic downtown as an area for greater intensification, new housing, and mixed-use infill development. Consequently, The Ontario Plan is consistent with SCAG's vision for the area and proposed implementation of the Compass 2% Strategy in that it accommodates population growth in the SCAG region, encourages growth in existing and emerging centers and along major transportation corridors, encourages mixed-use opportunities, and promotes employment opportunities in the housing-rich SANBAG subregion.

Conclusion

Although the increase in population, housing, and employment exceed SCAG's regional forecasts for the City of Ontario, The Ontario Plan improves the job/housing balance within the SANBAG subregion. Furthermore, The Ontario Plan accommodates future growth within the City by providing for infrastructure and associated public services to accommodate the projected growth of the City (see Chapter 5.9, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, Chapter 5.14, *Public Services*, Chapter 5.16, *Transportation and Traffic*, and

5. Environmental Analysis

POPULATION AND HOUSING

Chapter 5.17, *Utilities and Service Systems*). Lastly, The Ontario Plan is consistent with SCAG's Compass Blueprint program. Consequently, while buildout in accordance with the Proposed Land Use Plan would substantially increase both population and employment in the City, impacts would be less than significant.

IMPACT 5.13-2: BUILDOUT OF THE ONTARIO PLAN WOULD NOT DISPLACE PEOPLE OR HOUSING AND WOULD NOT NECESSITATE THE CONSTRUCTION OF REPLACEMENT HOUSING. [THRESHOLD P-2 AND P-3]

Impact Analysis: The purpose of The Ontario Plan is to provide orderly growth in the City of Ontario through the distribution, location, balance, and extent of land uses. The Ontario Plan Land Use Element does not change land use designations from residential to nonresidential and thus would not result in the displacement of people or housing. Furthermore, The Ontario Plan guides planning for new growth in the City, in part through designation of land uses that result in additional housing. The land use plan provides land use designations for a variety of housing types and provides for additional residential opportunities in areas that currently do not allow residential uses.

5.13.4 Relevant Policy Plan Policies and Programs

Community Economic Element

Complete Community

CE1-2 Jobs and Workforce Skills. We use our economic development resources to: 1) attract jobs suited for the skills and education of current and future City residents; 2) work with regional partners to provide opportunities for the labor force to improve its skills and education; and 3) attract businesses that increase Ontario's stake and participation in growing sectors of the regional and global economy.

CE1-6 Diversity in Housing. We collaborate with the development community to provide housing opportunities for every stage of life; we plan for a variety of housing types and price points to encourage the development of housing supportive of our efforts to attract business in growing sectors of the economy.

Environmental Resources Element

Air Quality

ER4-1 Land Use. We support the reduction of GHG and other local pollutant emissions through compact, mixed-use, and transit-oriented development and development that improves the regional jobs/housing balance.

Housing Element

Neighborhoods and Housing

H1-1 Housing Rehabilitation. We support the rehabilitation, maintenance, and improvement of single-family, multiple-family, and mobile homes through code compliance, removal of blight where necessary, and provision of rehabilitation assistance where feasible.

5. Environmental Analysis

POPULATION AND HOUSING

- H1-2 Neighborhood Conditions. We direct efforts to improve the long-term sustainability of neighborhoods through comprehensive planning, provision of neighborhood amenities, rehabilitation and maintenance of housing, and community building efforts.
- H1-3 Community Amenities. We shall provide adequate public services, infrastructure, open space, parking and traffic management, pedestrian and bicycle routes, and public safety for neighborhoods consistent with City master plans and neighborhood plans.
- H1-4 Historical Preservation. We support the preservation and enhancement of residential structures, properties, street designs, lot configurations, and other reminders of Ontario's past that are considered to be local historical or cultural resources.
- H1-5 Neighborhood Identity. We strengthen neighborhood identity through creating parks and recreational outlets, sponsoring neighborhood events, and encouraging resident participation in the planning and improvement of their neighborhood.

Housing Supply and Diversity

- H2-1 Corridor Housing. We revitalize transportation corridors by encouraging the production of higher density residential and mixed-uses that are architecturally, functionally, and aesthetically suited to corridors.
- H2-2 Historic Downtown. We foster a vibrant historic downtown through facilitating a wide range of housing types and affordability levels for households of all ages, housing preferences, and income levels.
- H2-3 Ontario Airport Metro Center. We foster a vibrant, urban, intense, and highly amenitized community in the Ontario Airport Metro Center Area through a mix of residential, entertainment, retail, and office-oriented uses.
- H2-4 New Model Colony. We support a premier lifestyle community in the New Model Colony, distinguished by diverse housing, highest design quality, and cohesive and highly amenitized neighborhoods.
- H2-5 Housing Design. We require architectural excellence through adherence to City design guidelines, thoughtful site planning, environmentally sustainable practices, and other best practices.
- H2-6 Infill Development. We support the revitalization of neighborhoods through the construction of higher-density residential developments on underutilized residential and commercial sites.

Governmental Constraints

- H3-1 Incentives. We maintain incentive programs that can be offered to projects that provide benefits to the community such as exceptional design quality, economic advantages, environmental sustainability, or other benefits that would otherwise be unrealized.
- H3-2 Flexible Standards. We allow flexibility in the application of residential and mixed-use development standards in order to gain benefits such as exceptional design quality, economic advantages, sustainability, or other benefits that would otherwise be unrealized.



5. *Environmental Analysis*

POPULATION AND HOUSING

- H3-3 Development Review. We maintain a residential development review process that provides certainty and transparency for project stakeholders and the public, yet allows for the appropriate review to facilitate quality housing development.
- H3-4 Financial Incentives. We consider financial incentives to facilitate and encourage the production, rehabilitation, or improvement of housing or provision of services where such activity furthers housing and community-wide goals.

Housing Assistance

- H4-1 Preservation of Affordable Apartments. We strive to facilitate the preservation of the affordability of publicly assisted apartments for lower income households through financial assistance, technical assistance, rehabilitation, and collaborative partnerships.
- H4-2 Homeownership Opportunities. We increase and expand homeownership rates for lower and moderate income households by offering financial assistance, low-interest loans, and educational resources, and by working in collaboration with partnerships.
- H4-3 Rental Assistance. We support the provision of rental assistance for individuals and families earning extremely low, very low, and low income with funding from the state and federal government.
- H4-4 Mixed-Income Housing. We encourage the integration of affordable housing in the New Model Colony, Ontario Airport Metro Center Area, and existing neighborhoods.
- H4-5 Collaborative Partnerships. We support collaborative partnerships of nonprofit organizations, affordable housing developers, major employers, and for-profit developers to produce affordable housing.
- H4-6 Fair Housing. We further fair housing by prohibiting discrimination in the housing market and providing education, support, and enforcement services to address discriminatory practices.

Special Needs

- H5-1 Senior Housing. We support the development of accessible and affordable senior housing and provide financial assistance for seniors to maintain and improve their homes.
- H5-2 Family Housing. We support the development of larger rental apartments that are appropriate for families with children, including, as feasible, the provision of services, recreation, and other amenities.
- H5-3 Disabled People. We increase the supply of permanent, affordable, and accessible housing for people with disabilities, and provide assistance to allow them to maintain and improve their homes.
- H5-4 Homeless People. We partner with nonprofit partners to provide emergency shelters, transitional housing, permanent supportive housing, and supportive services for people who are homeless.

5. Environmental Analysis

POPULATION AND HOUSING

- H5-5 Supportive Services. We financially support organizations, as feasible, that provide support services that meet the needs of those with special needs and further the greatest level of independence.
- H5-6 Partnerships. We collaborate with nonprofit organizations, private developers, employers, government agencies, and other interested parties to develop affordable housing and provide support services.

Land Use Element

Balance

- LU1-1 Strategic Growth. We concentrate growth in strategic locations that help create place and identity, maximize available and planned infrastructure, and foster the development of transit.
- LU1-2 Sustainable Community Strategy. We integrate state, regional, and local Sustainable Community/Smart Growth principles into the development and entitlement process.
- LU1-5 Jobs/Housing Balance. We coordinate land use, infrastructure, and transportation planning and analysis with regional, county, and other local agencies to further regional and subregional goals for jobs/housing balance.
- LU1-6 Complete Community. We encourage a variety of land uses and building types that result in a complete community where residents at all stages of life, employers, workers, and visitors have a wide spectrum of choices of where they can live, work, shop, and recreate within Ontario.



Flexibility

- LU3-3 Land Use Flexibility. We consider uses not typically permitted within a land use category if doing so improves livability, reduces vehicular trips, creates community gathering places and activity nodes, and helps create identity.

Airport Environs

- LU5-1 Coordination with Airport Authorities. We collaborate with FAA, Caltrans Division of Aeronautics, airport owners, neighboring jurisdictions, and other stakeholders in the preparation, update, and maintenance of airport-related plans, including this Policy Plan.
- LU5-2 Future Planning Efforts. We coordinate with airport authorities to ensure The Ontario Plan is consistent with airport law and/or adopted master plans and land use compatibility plans for the LAONT and Chino Airports.
- LU5-3 Airport Impacts. We work with agencies to mitigate the impacts and hazards related to airport operations.
- LU5-4 Los Angeles/Ontario Airport Land Use Commission. We will fully comply with state statutes regarding the establishment of a City-administered Airport Land Use Commission for LAONT.

5. Environmental Analysis

POPULATION AND HOUSING

5.13.5 Existing Regulations and Standard Conditions

No regulations are applicable for population and housing.

5.13.6 Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Upon implementation of regulatory requirements and compliance with The Ontario Plan policies and programs, the following impacts would be less than significant: 5.13-1 and 5.13-2.

5.13.7 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts were identified and no mitigation measures are necessary.

5.13.8 Level of Significance After Mitigation

No significant adverse impacts were identified and no significant unavoidable impacts relating to population and housing remain.